PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

See form PCT/SA/220 WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/SA/210 (second sheet) POR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below POT/F/P20/A002975 International application No. PCT/F/P20/A002975 Priority date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 10.04.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A47C/1.032 Applicant International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A47C/1.032 Applicant Box No. II Priority Box No. III Priority Box No. III Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability (citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain decrease it and application and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VII Certain decrease it in the international application Box No. VIII Certain decrease in the international application Box No. VIII Certain Deservations on the international application For No. VIII Certain Deservations on the international application Pox No. VIII Certain Deservations on the international application For No. VIII Certain Deservations on the international application For No. VIII Certain Deservations on the international opticity ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority deter than this one and and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Deservations of this international Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220.	To:	RNATIONAL SEA		Onii i	PCT	
International Searching Authority (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (daymonthyear) see form PCT/SA/210 (second sheat)	10:					ГОТ
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/SA/220 The FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		see form	PCT/ISA/220		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220 (second sheet) PFOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below International application No. PCT/ISA/220 International application No. 22.03.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A47C1/032 Applicant IMARC S.P.A. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application Box No. VI Certain observations on the international application Box No. VI Certain observations on the international application For Witten opinion of the International Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 65.1 bis(b) that written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the priority date, whichever expires later. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.					((PCT Rule 43bis.1)
International application No. PCT/EP2004/002975 22.03.2004 10.04.2003 10.					1	ee form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A47C1032 Applicant IMARC S.P.A. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion		-				
APPLICANT IMARC S.P.A. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion				1	day/month/year)	
Applicant IMARC S.P.A. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion			sification (IPC) or	both national classification	and IPC	
IMARC S.P.A. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. IV Each of unity of invention □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinion of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the international Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						
Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	11017					
 Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 	1.	This opinion co	ontains indication	ons relating to the follo	owing items:	
 Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 		_		_	J	
□ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.				JIIIO11		
Box No. IV		_	•	ment of opinion with reas	ard to novelty inventi	ive step and industrial applicability
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.		_		·	ard to noverty, inventi	we step and industrial applicability
 □ Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. 			Reasoned stat	ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i>		
□ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.		☐ Box No. VI		·	•	
□ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.		☐ Box No. VII	Certain defects	s in the international app	lication	
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.		☐ Box No. VIII				
written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	2.	FURTHER ACTI	ION			
submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.		written opinion of the applicant cho International Bur	f the Internation: ooses an Author eau under Rule	al Preliminary Examining ity other than this one to	g Authority ("IPEA"). I be the IPEA and the	However, this does not apply where chosen IPEA has notifed the
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.		submit to the IPE months from the	EA a written reply date of mailing of	y together, where approp	priate, with amendme	ents, before the expiration of three
		For further option	ns, see Form PC	CT/ISA/220.		
Name and politics address of the ISA:	3.	For further details	s, see notes to F	Form PCT/ISA/220.		
Name and mailing address of the ISA.						
	Non	o and mailing add	an af the ICA		Authorized Officer	



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

MacCormick, D

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7959



10/552141 JC09 Rec'd PCT/PTO 07 OCT 2003 International application No.

PCT/EP2004/002975

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

Box No. I Basis of the opinion 1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item. This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)). 2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of: a. type of material: a sequence listing table(s) related to the sequence listing b. format of material: in written format in computer readable form c. time of filing/furnishing: contained in the international application as filed. filed together with the international application in computer readable form. furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished. 4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/002975

_						
	Box No. II Prior	ity				
1.		document has not bee	en furnishe	d:		
	⊠ copy	of the earlier application	on whose p	riority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).		
	☐ transl	ation of the earlier app	olication who	ose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).		
	Consequently nevertheless	rit has not been possil been established on th	ble to consi ne assumpt	ider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has ion that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.		
2.	☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.					
3.		ations, if necessary:	der Rule 43	Bbis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or		
	industrial applica	ability; citations and	explanatio	ns supporting such statement		
	Statement		· <u>·</u>			
	Novelty (N)		Claims Claims	1,4-6		
	Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims Claims	2,3		
	Industrial applicab	nility (IA) Yes:	Claims Claims	1-6		

see separate sheet

International application No.

PCT/EP04/02975

Re Item V

Reference is made to the following document: D1: US-A-5 116 016.

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

The document **D1** discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A device for adjusting the degree of preload of springs in a chair mechanisms which comprise two parts hinged apart (see fig.1) and elastic means (6) maintaining said parts elastically spaced apart, said device comprising: a first element (2) with at least one inclined surface (21) and coupled to one of the other parts, a second element (9) provided with at least one appendix (3) interacting with the inclined surface (21) of the first element (2), and coupled to the elastic means (6), means (5) for inducing axial rotation of one of the elements (2), means for blocking rotation of the other element (see column 3, lines 52-55).

Dependent claim 4-6 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, see document D1 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.

However, the combination of the features of dependent claims 2 and 3 appears is neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art.